REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending in the present patent application. Applicant has added claims 32-34. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and re-examination of claims 1-34 in the present patent application and presents the following arguments:

Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callahan et al. (U.S. patent no. 5,012,433) in view of Hartog et al. (U.S. patent no. 5,369,741). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner states:

1. As to claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, the prior art Callahan had:
A.) The step of clipping the image data to obtain clipped image data (**col. 7, lines 25-43; fig. 6**). Callahan teaches the clipping of graphic primitives for use in a computer graphics workstation. The graphic primitives are the images that are being clipped.
B.) The step of transmitting the clipped image data from a transmitter to a receiver and the receiver scaling the clipped image data for display (**col. 2, lines 49-65; col. 8, lines 18-50; col. 9; fig. 1, 4, 8-9b**). Callahan teaches the transmitter and receiver in his graphic workstation. The graphic workstation removes all graphic primitives, mapping the clipping volume into a virtual viewport, and performing post transformation operations as a processor clips a virtual viewport to the real viewport. The virtual viewport and the real viewport functionality are the same as the transmitter and receiver. As stated in the specification of the application, page 3, lines 5-6, a transmitter and a receiver is the exchange of information between computers on a network. Callahan teaches the exchange of information between the virtual viewport and the real viewport for the clipped image. Furthermore, Callahan teaches the scaling the clipped image data for display when he discloses the step by step process of calculating the slipping boundaries.

However, Callahan fails to explicitly teach a computer readable code. Callahan's system is in a computer system (column 4; fig. 2-4) and the computer system has an information system application in order for the scripts or coding to work. Nevertheless, Hartog clearly teaches a computer readable code when he discloses the boundary clipper outcodes and the commands of the computer program to operate the clipping of images. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer readable code because Hartog teaches the commands and execution of clipping the images (**col. 7, lines 4-26; fig. 2-3**).

2. As to claims 2, 12, and 22, Hartog discloses a clip-list (**col. 1, lines 55-67; col. 2**). Hartog defines the clipping regions in the table as a list of area to be clipped.

3. As to claims 3-4, 13-14, and 23-24, Hartog discloses the determinations of a pixel in the image to a location in at least one clipping region (**col. 8**).

4. As to claims 5-7, 15-17, and 25-27, Callahan discloses the location comprises a corner of the rectangle and nearest pixels (**col. 7; col. 8, lines 1-18**). Callahan teaches the four corners of the polygon are computed by their directions and the interior pixels to the rectangles.

5. The limitations of claims 8-10, 18-20, and 28-30 are analyzed as discussed with respect to claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 above.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that claims 1-31 are not anticipated by Callahan in view of Hartog for at least the following reasons.

1. The present invention is not anticipated by Callahan in view of Hartog because the prior art does not teach, describe or suggest the step of "transmitting said clipped image data from a transmitter to a receiver".

The Examiner relies upon Callahan to teach the step of transmitting said clipped image data from a transmitter to a receiver. Callahan does not teach, describe or suggest transmitting said clipped image data from a transmitter to a receiver. Callahan teaches only clipping a virtual viewport to a real viewport. The virtual viewport and real viewport reside in the same computer. The same computer cannot be both a transmitter and a receiver. Thus, Callahan does not teach, describe or suggest transmitting clipped image data between computers on a network.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach, describe or suggest the present invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 and dependent claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-34 are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that pending claims 1-34 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

COUDERT BROTHERS

By: _____

Micah Goldsmith
Reg. No. 43,638